



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,394	12/22/2004	Christoph Siegelin	76.0733/PR	2863
41754	7590	12/14/2010		
THE JANSSON FIRM 3616 Far West Blvd Ste 117-314 AUSTIN, TX 78731				
EXAMINER				
CHRZANOWSKI, MATTHEW R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2186				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/14/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lawfirm@thejanssonfirm.com

Pchr@thejanssonfirm.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/519,394	Applicant(s) SIEGELIN ET AL.	
	Examiner MATTHEW R. CHRZANOWSKI	Art Unit 2186	

All Participants:
Status of Application: appeal brief filed

 (1) MATTHEW R. CHRZANOWSKI.

(3) _____.

 (2) Pehr Jansson (REG. # 35759).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 December 2010
Time: afternoon
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
claim 1, appeal brief arguments, specifically towards current application's FIG. 3
Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:
Ban
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Courtesy call in interest of compact prosecution, pointing out arguments concerning the term "mirror area". First the term mirror area is not used as one of ordinary skill in the art would commonly accept as it's meaning. The claim language defines the term "mirror area" be an area divided into at least two physical areas each designated to correspond to a same logical area for storing content written to the logical area. This broad claim language and the specification does not recite that the mirror area has anything to do with the "mirroring" or "copying" or "duplication" of data in the particular area, nor does it appear Applicant argues such. However, as previously discussed with appellant in interview, the subject matter as described in FIG. 3, including a fixed association of physical blocks (ZPx) only mapped to a particular logical block (ZL), and the mirror area is either ZPu, ZPu, ZPi, ZPi concatenated (or each ZP is a separate mirror area, ie. the a single ZP is a single mirror area or the four ZP physical blocks are one mirror area), wherein one of the physical blocks in the mirror (ZPu, ZPu, ZPi, ZPi) is the active area containing the actual up-to-date data, while the other physical blocks are inactive containing old data to be erased or already erased, blocks, etc. The claim language does not reflect such interpretations. If properly claimed, and supported by the Specification it appears this subject matter would overcome the prior art of record, and require further search and/or consideration.

/Matt Kim/
SPE, AU2186